IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

WEDNESDAY, THE TWENTIETH DAY OF JULY
TWO THOUSAND AND FIVE

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE ELIPE DHARMA RAO

WRIT PETITION NO : 9588 of 1999

Between:

1. Ad-Age Outdoor Advertising (Pvt.) Limited, rep by its Director Syed Musharaff Mehdi,S/o. S.Y.Nawab, R/o. AG-8, Matrusri Apartments, Hyderguda, Hyderabad.

2. Pioneer Publicity Services, rep by its Proprietor Mr.S.Y.Nawab, 3-5-141/3/1, Eden Garden, Ramkoti, Hyderabad.

3. Jaguar Ads, rep by its Proprietor Mr. Syed Iqbal Mehdi,S/o. S.Y. Nawab 3-5-141/3/1, Eden Garden Ramkoti, Hyderabad.

4. Vision Ads, rep by Proprietor Mr.Syed Iftaquar Mehdi,S/o. S.Y.Nawab, 405, Rose Block, GardenTowers, Masab Tank, Hyderabad.

5. Olympus Outdoor Advertising, rep by its Proprietrix Mrs. Nuzhat Bamo, W/o.Syed Iqbal Mehdi, 405, Rose Block, Garden Towers, Masab Tank, Hyderabad.

6. Safari Ads, rep by its Proprietor Mr.Syed Muzaffar Mehdi,S/o. S.Y. Nawab, AG-9, Matrusri Appartments, Hyderguda, Hyderabad – 500 029.

..... PETITIONERS

AND

Hyderabad Municipal Co-operation, rep by its Commissioner,
Near Tank Bund, Hyderabad.

.....RESPONDENT

Petition under Article 226 of the constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the Affidavit filed herein the High Court will be pleased to declare the public notification No.MCH/CVO/ADV/99-1, dt.14.4.1999 issued by the

respondent herein and published in Deccan Chronicle dt. 19.4.1999, as illegal, arbitrary and unjust, by issuing appropriate Writ, Order or direction and pass such other order or orders, as may be deemed fit and proper.

Counsel for the Petitioner:MR.M.V.S.SURESH KUMAR

Counsel for the sole Respondent : MR.RAMA RAO GHANTA, ADVOCATE GENERAL.

The Court made the following :

O R D E R:

-

This writ petition filed by the petitioners against the notification dated 14.04.1999

issued by the respondent-Municipality for the existing year 1999-2000 for obtaining written permission to exhibit advertisements in twin cities has already been over. Hence, the writ petition has become infructuous.

The writ petition is accordingly dismissed as infructuous. No costs.

_____

E.DHARMA RAO J.,

Dt.20.07.2005

tjs

To

1. Commissioner, Hyderabad Municipal Co-operation, Near Tank Bund, Hyderabad.

2. 2 C.Cs to the Advocate General

3) 2 CD copies

4) 1 CC to MR.M.V.SURESH KUMAR